



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

God, as a dreamer, looking far down into the future with no thought of his own times, of his own surroundings. But this view, while true in part, is, when taken as a whole, entirely false and misleading.

Let us get a correct idea of the work and life of the prophet; let us understand that we who preach are, in the true sense of the word, *prophets*; for that word does not strictly mean *fore-teller*, but *for-teller*, not one who speaks *before-hand*, but one who speaks *for* another, God. And with this conception, remembering, likewise, that these men spoke as prompted by the events of their times, by the sins and crimes of their fellow-men, by political prosperity or adversity, for such is often God's way of prompting men to the service he desires,—keeping all this in mind, let us study the sermons of Isaiah, whose most frequent theme was “salvation,” the sermons of Hosea, who all the time preached “love,” the sermons of Amos, whose text was “justice,” the story of Jonah, the keynote to which was “repentance brings salvation.”

The Old Testament prophets were preachers, their words were sermons, some written and never spoken, some spoken and written later,—sermons which the Christian minister will find, when *treated* as sermons, to be models of eloquence, expression, and thought.

The Use of Common Sense in Interpretation.—Interpreters of the Bible, in our day, may conveniently be divided into three great schools: (1) the rationalistic, or naturalistic, (2) the allegorizing, or spiritualizing, and (3) the historico-grammatical. Each school starts with certain great principles, and does its work in accordance with these principles. The naturalist says, Miracles were never wrought, events were never predicted, there is no such thing as the supernatural. The allegorist says, There is contained in every passage of Scripture, besides the usual sense, a hidden sense, an obscure meaning, for the discovery of which the interpreter can use no principles or laws, but must depend upon his individual judgment; this second and independent meaning is, however, by far the more important. The historico-grammatical interpreter says, Words have certain definite significations; grammatical forms have an established force; that signification and that force which usage has assigned a given word or form, with such modification as is required by the historical circumstances of the writer, were the signification and the force *divinely* intended to be conveyed. Ascertain these, and you have interpreted the passage under consideration.

Now it is plainly evident that, to whatever class one may belong, there is, after all that may be said, a large field for the use of common sense. But there are some who go so far as to say that the great majority of Bible interpreters, of every school, however wise they may be in other pursuits, abandon for the most part this important accompaniment, at the very moment the study of a scriptural passage is taken up. And there is, it must be confessed, too much truth in this assertion.

We must admit that of the disciple of the naturalistic or the allegorizing schools, working, as he does, according to principles so contrary to all that is known and reasonable, little can be expected. But how is it with those of the third school, which may be truly said to be *the* school of our century? Is there any excuse for the display of a lack of common sense on the part of those who work with lexicon and grammar, and whose results are supposed to be in accord with these?

What are the facts? Inasmuch as little or no systematic Bible exposition is given from the modern pulpit (and surely the absence of this exposition is not due to the absence of a need of it and of a desire for it), we must determine whether or not good judgment is displayed by the Bible interpreters of our day, i. e., by the ministers (for they are *the* Bible interpreters), from the use made of the Bible in the sermons preached from week to week. The preacher preaches the Bible as he understands it; what he preaches *from* a given text must be understood to be his interpretation of that text. But, does one minister in five, *once in five times*, really give to his people the true meaning of his text, or preach a sermon based directly on that meaning? Is it not the burden of the hour, in homiletical circles, that the preacher does not interpret aright the text on which his preaching is based; that in many, and oh! how many, cases there is seemingly an utter lack of judgment, of common sense, in the interpretation of the text?

It is possible that the feeling in reference to this matter is a slightly exaggerated one; but that there is abundant ground for a very strong feeling of this kind is undoubtedly true.

Nor can this failure to make the correct use of Scripture be attributed to any other cause than to a failure to employ common sense. For the men who make this fatal mistake are the educated as well as the uneducated. They have within their reach all needed helps for ascertaining the true meaning. They, doubtless, *often* make use of these helps. And still they fail. These men *have* the judgment needed, the common sense required, but they, somehow or other, neglect to employ it. Why? *It is for them to answer.*

The Death of M. M. Kalisch.—Those American students who have studied the works of Dr. Kalisch must experience a deep regret that he was not able to complete his work on the Pentateuch. His commentaries, while in many respects unsatisfactory, were to be classed as among the most helpful ever written. Perhaps we can do no better than to append the following note from *The Athenæum* (Sept. 5th), which gives, on the whole, a true estimate of the man and his works:

“By the death of Dr. Kalisch, which took place on the 23rd of August, one of the most learned of Jewish scholars has been removed at the comparatively early age of fifty-seven. For nearly twelve years past he has been in indifferent health, and he was thus prevented from fully achieving the aim he had set before him in life—a complete critical edition of the Pentateuch. Coming to England as a young man whose political opinions were displeasing to the Prussian authorities of the time, Dr. Kalisch early attracted the notice of the Rothschilds, in whose family he was adopted as tutor. This position soon placed him in such circumstances that he was enabled to devote himself entirely to the production of a commentary on the Bible, liberal in its critical views, accurate and full in its grammatical and archæological explanations. The plan which Dr. Kalisch laid down for his work soon made it evident that he could not hope to treat the whole Bible in so thorough a fashion, and his scheme was reduced within more manageable limits—a commentary on the Pentateuch. Of this the ‘Exodus’ appeared first in 1855, the ‘Genesis’ in 1858, and the ‘Leviticus’ in two bulky volumes, in 1867 and 1872 respectively. It may be said of them that in each case they represent the highest water-mark of continental scholarship at the date of issue. Of the ‘Leviticus,’ indeed, something more than this can be said. Here Dr. Kalisch shows himself a *Wellhausianer* before Wellhausen. He regarded Leviticus as the last stage in the formation of the Pentateuch, against what was then the current opinion. He based his conclusion on very elaborate examination of the development of institutions, and the bulk of his commentary is taken up with a series of essays which he rightly terms ‘Treatises,’ dealing with the successive stages of